The self is undifferentiated in time and space. It is itself alone existing as a totality and constantly emerging. —CLARK E. MOUSTAKAS

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 54 JUNE, 1966 NUMBER 8

THE HELP OF THE COMPANIONS

Look for the warrior and let him fight in thee.
—*Light on the Path*

WHEN it comes to the heroism disciples are called upon to practice, the personal man shrinks in despair. And, indeed, he is right. The personal man has only the resources of the personal nature. He knows only the longings which are *reflected* from the vision of the higher ego, and since the mirror is the stuff of the psyche, the mortality of its compound nature produces feelings of overwhelming inadequacy.

There is deep paradox here. For what seems "heroic" to the personality is simply the true ego's natural way of life. So it is that in moments of extremity, in those interludes produced by Karma when a conspiracy of circumstance paralyzes the energies of personal consciousness to the point of utter quiescence, the personal hungering and longing drop away and for a time the ego suffuses the man with its serene awareness and sure knowledge of the fitness of things. In that golden moment, the eye of Krishna looks through the eye of the man; the warrior has come upon the scene.

Of such wondrous inner experiences, often we are able to preserve only the memory of the presence that was upon us. It is a feeling to be cherished, a reality to be held with all the tenacity one can muster, since this is the presence of the man that was, that is, and will be, for whom the hour will never strike.

We think of cycles as coming upon us out of the past. Cycles are indeed of this sort. They make the settings of the evolutionary pilgrimage. But there are also cycles which arise from self-induced strivings toward the inner life. The presence of the warrior needs invitation; he cannot come unbidden, although, out of an ancient past, from causes long forgotten, he may appear with silent declaration of the divine essence in each one. But to *study* about his reality; to prepare a welcome for him in the mind; to shut out those insolent, crowding influences that would leave him no place to stand in the chariot—these are steps that can be taken consciously, by those willing to follow the example of those who have gone that way before, and who come as teachers and lovers of the race.

A theosophical association is a humble undertaking. Yet it is also a brave and noble undertaking. It is a response to the high call of Evolution itself. It exists to make a place for the heroic element in human beings. In this sense, it is a healing and restorative struggle in behalf of all mankind.

There is no hope for the future save as men learn to seek out their better selves within. There is no promise in politics, in sociology or any branch of science, unless men bespeak themselves about their true selves, and try to feel within the promise of their own potentialities. It is for this reason that the *teachings* have such great importance. Men cannot "think" ideas of which they have not heard—or will not, except for the few in whom the heroic element is already strong. And these, one may suppose, will find their way with only a little assistance.

But the great mass of mankind need to hear the Law. They need to hear the word about their potential divinity. Their quavering fears will not depart of themselves; only in the presence of strong words and thoughts concerning the potential greatness of the very principle of being human will their weakness slowly give way to strength, and the actual labors of individual growth and self-reliance begin.

A lodge is a place where help and hope exist for mankind. It may move men to find the path, from the very simplicity and humbleness of lodge work. It is not the flashy utterance, the skillful phrase, that touches the heart, but the expression of ordinary human beings who have found in themselves a depth of conviction and cleave to it as to their very lives.

Thus have I heard is more than a formula of self-effacing modesty. It is a pointing to the teachers, but it is also the testament of

one who has found the Way. It is the shining honesty of a grateful heart. It is the help of the Companions—what they can do, and what no one else in the wide world can do, for searchers and hungering ones like themselves.

GUIDE LINES

Our duty is to never consider our ability, but to do what comes to be done in whatever way we can, no matter how inadequate the work appears to others.

There can be no greater pleasure than to further the internal progress of any real student and aspirant . . . each additional member with right spirit strengthens the body for its career and work. The main thing is for the members to study and know Theosophy, for if they do not know it, how can they give any of it to others?

If we admit that we are in the stream of evolution, then each circumstance must be to us quite right. And in our failures to perform set acts should be our greatest helps, for we can in no other way learn that calmness which Krishna insists upon. If all our plans succeeded, then no contrasts would appear to us. Also those plans we make may all be made ignorantly and thus wrongly, and kind Nature will not permit us to carry them out. If you try to put into practice what in your inner life you hold to be right, you will be more ready to receive helpful thoughts and the inner life will grow more real.

Desire ardently to do, and even when you shall not have succeeded in carrying out anything but some small duties . . . your strong desire will strike like Vulcan upon other hearts in the world.

The best stand to take is—it is all right as it is now, and when the time comes for it to be better, it will be so. Meanwhile we have a duty to see that we do all we can *in our own place* as we see best, undisturbed and undismayed by aught.

Hold fast in silence to all that is your own, for you will need it in the fight; but never, *never* desire to get knowledge or power for any other purpose than to give it on the altar, for thus alone can it be saved to you.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

TELL-TALE FACES

A STORY tells that Abraham Lincoln once rejected an applicant for a position in government on the ground that he did not like the job-seeker's face. Chided that a person is not responsible for his face, Lincoln retorted: Oh, yes he is. After forty, everyone has the face he created.

You see self-made faces all about you. When walking the streets of any large city, a perceptive person is often overwhelmed by the thought that the majority of the passers-by appear to be "mindless men," corresponding to those mentioned in *The Secret Doctrine*. A study of individual faces suggests that the character of each person is etched there, for those who can see, as clearly as the captions in a tabloid newspaper. A grinning façade only half conceals, for instance, years of self-pity and greed. Another countenance is limned by cruelty and cunning of which the owner is usually unaware. Other faces betray envy, prejudice, discontent. Thus, average humanity drifts hither and yon, propelled by uncontrolled passion and desire. These are the worshippers of outward show and material achievement. They are the rigid ones who everywhere seek to keep things as they are. They are the supporters of dogmatic religions and corrupt governments, upon whom unscrupulous politicians can always count to vote for their bogus campaign promises.

It is more difficult to detect the meaning of one's own face, or to see ourselves as others do, since, when we look into the mirror, we unconsciously primp. Does it not behoove us, therefore, to be gentle and understanding of our fellow-men rather than critical and harsh?

For centuries dogmatic religious teaching has given mankind a false picture of itself. Instead of inculcating the knowledge of man's divinity and thus inspiring the best efforts in the human mind and heart, the clergy decry man as a "miserable, weak sinner," and order him to fear an *outside* God. The resulting anxiety and depression push aside courage and aspiration. H. P. Blavatsky corrects this theological distortion:

> Occultism permits no other image than that of the living

> image of divine man (the symbol of humanity) on earth. The Kabbala teaches that this divine Image, the copy of the sublime and holy upper Image (the Elohim) has now changed into another similitude, owing to the development of men's sinful nature. It is only the upper divine Image (the Ego) which is the same; the lower (personality) has changed, and man, now fearing the wild beasts, has grown to bear on his face the similitude of many of them. (*The Theosophical Glossary*: "Image.")

Few people have any conception of the dynamic power of an Image, or of the Imagination. Most often, imagination is thought to be synonymous with fancy. The Christian Gnostics and other ancient peoples defined it as "the image-making faculty" which, together with Will, constitutes the creative power in the Universe and in Man. Deity, the Gnostics said, first formed a picture of the universe-to-be, which, by gradual stages of emanation, or densification, came forth into objectivity on the material plane. It is by a process of "conforming" to an Image or to an Idea that everything that exists has *come* into being. The clothes a person wears, the house he lives in, the car he drives, the musical instruments he plays, all had their beginnings *in idea;* and all were brought into being by the Imagination and the Will. But there is more—the trees, blossoms, and fruit, the birds in radiant plumage, the insects and animals in infinite species and shapes—these, too, were given their designs by Imagination, and are the handiwork and artistry of superior Beings, the Dhyanis, or Arch-angels. And even man was created *in the image* of God, or the Gods.

> ". . . and God [the Elohim] said, Let us make man in *our* [plural] image." (Genesis 1: 26.)

A realm of "eternal Ideas" was primary in Plato's teaching: "Ideas rule the world." Solomon expressed the idea that there is "no new thing under the sun," indicating that everything that now exists has always existed. The same teachings are found in *The Secret Doctrine*:

> The active Power, the "Perpetual motion of the great Breath" only awakens [not *creates*] Kosmos at the dawn of every new Period, setting it into motion by means of the two contrary Forces, and thus causing it to become objective on the plane of Illusion. In other words, that dual motion transfers Kosmos from the plane of the Eternal Ideal into that of finite manifestation, or from the *Noumenal* to the *phenomenal* plane. Everything that *is, was* and *will be,* eternally IS, even the countless forms, which are finite and perishable only in their objective, not in their

> *ideal* Form. They existed as Ideas, in the Eternity, and when they pass away, will exist as reflections. Neither the form of man, nor that of any animal, plant or stone has ever been *created*, and it is only on this plane of ours that it commenced "becoming," *i.e.*, objectivizing into its present materiality, or expanding *from within outwards*, from the most sublimated and supersensuous essence into its grossest appearance. (*S.D.* I, 282.)
>
> Occultism teaches that no form can be given to anything, either by nature or by man, whose ideal type does not already exist on the subjective plane. More than this; that no such form or shape can possibly enter man's consciousness, or evolve in his imagination, which does not exist in prototype, at least as an approximation. (*Loc. cit.*, fn.)

The paramount need of our age, then, is a true Image, of which Humanity has lost sight. Esoteric philosophy alone can revive the authentic image of Divine Man which, however obscured it may have become, is ever present in every human heart.

The undiscerning criteria of lower Manas, which are those of the crowd, lead to the erroneous conclusion that mankind is an inferior lot, and perhaps not worth saving. But for those who have assimilated even a token of theosophic philosophy, it becomes an entirely different matter. To the true Theosophist, mankind is himself. How is it that we are able to see what we do in the faces of our fellow men? If we detect in the countenance of another the petty elements of pride and vanity, what else can it mean but that we, too, possess the same defects to some degree? How can envy be recognized except through our own experience of the same fault? Would despondency be known were it not that that vice is harbored in the recesses of the heart? It is through our own hate, whether latent, active, or conquered, that hate can be espied in others. Realization of this great principle of homogeneity would help to tear down the separative walls of superiority. To see ourselves in another is the beginning, and the meaning, of sympathy—*feeling with*. And sympathy expanded may in time become Compassion. William Q. Judge tells us:

> I was reading a book and looking around within myself to see how I could enlarge my idea of brotherhood. Practice in benevolence will not give it its full growth. I had to find means of reaching further, and struck on this, which is as old as old age.
>
> I am not separate from anything. "I am that which is." That is, I am Brahma, and Brahma is everything. But being in an illusionary world, I am surrounded by certain appearances that seem to

> make me separate. So I will proceed to mentally state and accept that I am all these illusions. I am my friends—and then I went to them in general and in particular. I am my enemies; then I felt them all. I am the poor and the wicked; I am the ignorant. Those moments of intellectual gloom are the moments when I am influenced by those ignorant ones who are myself. All this in my nation. But there are many nations, and to those I go in mind: I feel and I am them all, with what they hold of superstition or of wisdom or evil. All, all is myself. (*Letters That Have Helped Me*, pp. 6-7.)

A transcendent illustration of this sort of identification and of compassion is seen in a drama that began thousands of years ago in ancient Lanka, now Ceylon. Among the people of that country there was a race of dwarfs named the Mulu-Kurumbs. Repulsively ugly creatures, they were sorcerers of the wickedest sort. They found pleasure in forcing others to do their will. So degenerate and dangerous did they ultimately become that the King of Lanka resolved to destroy them all by throwing them into the sea. Also inhabiting the land was a race of gods, the Todas, who were beautiful, holy, pure. When they learned of the King's plan to drown the dwarfs, the Todas petitioned that they be forgiven. At first the King refused, determined to destroy the abhorrent creatures. The leader of the Todas then made the King an offer: if the dwarfs would be saved, the Todas would take them away to an isolated territory and watch over them so they no longer could injure others. The King assented and the Mulu-Kurumbs were taken by the Todas to the high plateaus of the Nilghiri Mountains in Southern India, where the two races lived side by side for centuries.

A legend arose among the people of the lowlands that the inaccessible mountain-fastnesses were sacred, for gods dwelled there; and none were to intrude into their precincts. Early in the nineteenth century two Englishmen, on a hunting safari, heard the legend and determined to make the arduous ascent to the sacred heights. They established the ancient legend as fact, and had a wondrous tale to tell.

Why did the Todas choose to make this sacrifice? In *People of the Blue Mountains,* H. P. Blavatsky tells of the occult powers possessed by both these races (pp. 185-6): "According to us—and it is our unshakable conviction—the Todds (Todas) are the disciples —half unconscious, perhaps, of the antique science of *white* Magic, while the Moulou-Kourombs remain the odious offspring of *black*

magic or sorcery." Is it possible that, in the distant past, the ancestors of these two races were co-disciples in the same school of Occult Science, that one group chose the right path and the other the wrong? And might not the later Todas and Mulu-Kurumbs, being reincarnated, have felt the ancient bond of co-discipleship?

> It ought to be understood that up to a certain point all students of magic, or occultism, journey together. By and by is reached *a place where two roads meet,* or where the common path divides, and the *awful voice from the silence,* heard only in the recesses of the individual soul utters its stern command: *"Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."* Instead of black and white magic, read black and white *motive.* (THEOSOPHY 43:537.)

In this legend of the Todas and the Mulu-Kurumbs is enacted the drama of the human soul in which each individual will at some point in his evolutionary journey play a part. Every human being is ever marching toward his destiny. And while in the present incarnation he may not have the slightest knowledge of white or black magic, his time for knowing and choosing will come. The thoughts, feelings, aspirations, and especially the motives he allows to take root in his heart, are the transforming forces of Occultism. It is the Image he holds and, through discipline, strives toward that determines his Karma and ultimately fashions him into the likeness of either the Toda or the Mulu-Kurumb. (We all can recall instances of often baffling changes in facial features—a youthful loveliness shifting to ugliness, or a plain, awkward child growing into gracious, radiant maturity.)

But many faces show no evidence of self-transformation, of conquest of self by the SELF within. Esoteric Philosophy teaches, however, that within the heart of each fellow-pilgrim resides the Divine Man, a God of almost infinite power; and that, given time, experience, and encouragement—and above all, a Toda-like understanding by their fellows—each is capable of working the change to the likeness of his highest Ideals. It is for this, for reviving the Image of Divine Man, that the Masters of Wisdom sacrifice themselves life after life. Shall we, their Companions, do less? Let us, rather, heed the ancient Pledge of Kwan Yin, which epitomizes the message of Universal Brotherhood: NEVER WILL I SEEK NOR RECEIVE PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL SALVATION. NEVER WILL I ENTER INTO FINAL PEACE ALONE; BUT FOREVER AND EVERYWHERE WILL I LIVE AND STRIVE FOR THE REDEMPTION OF EVERY CREATURE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

YOUTH FORUM

Inquirers often ask students of Theosophy difficult philosophical questions. Although one may have studied Theosophy for many years, there is still liable to be self-consciousness in his answer or comment. What to say and how to say it confront every serious student when he is asked to give an account of Theosophical principles. Normally, more is wanted by a question than just a dictionary answer. What, for example, would be a proper definition of the word "Manas," telling its meaning and imparting a feeling about it?

Students are generally familiar with basic Theosophical concepts. Each has a ready vocabulary and remembers phrases and images by chapter and verse, so it is not a lack of ideas which often makes the student uncertain when asked a fundamental question. Yet no question can be properly answered until this self-consciousness passes. The feeling of inadequacy simply accents the student-life as contrasted to that of a teacher. How vain to presume to know anything so completely as to be free from all doubt! Our knowledge, for the most part, must be of the nature of those "who in humbleness" repeat what they have "heard."

What is our business, then, in this matter of answering questions? What is achieved by discussing the ideas of a philosophy which purports to embrace the meaning of all life? Are "converts" the prize? Or perhaps a logical consistency which flatters the intellect? We give these questions silent answers. Those answers, in turn, set the mood for what we have to say and are, to that extent, as important. A precise logic and proper vocabulary may be impressive to a visitor —but what will he carry away from his first encounter with Theosophy: abstruse philosophy or threads of meaning which reach to his heart?

To return to our original question, What is a proper definition of Manas? Only a wide philosophical context allows such a question to be answered. H. P. Blavatsky's context was the present transitional epoch of awakening intelligence and spiritual potential; Mr. Judge spoke to the chained Ego of this cycle. What they said was

not different, but together they gave a synthesis of the general and particular principles of evolution as it is working now. For man this is a period of manasic opportunity.

As with all fundamental principles, Manas is an elastic term with numerous meanings. It refers to Man, Mind, and Thought. It is the self-existent principle of intelligent and moral being. Here is a Protean idea reaching from the high metaphysics of the Logos and Primeval Intelligence down to the pernicious uses of the mind by thieves and inquisitors. The very universal application of Manas allows a man to define his existence by the uses to which he puts his mind.

It may be helpful to refer to two classical figures who bridged the occupations of higher and lower Manas. Both Sophocles' King Oedipus and Aeschylus' Prometheus remain tragic figures in this age of steel cities and iron hearts, where the achievement of high vision and perception is accomplished only through interminable pain and suffering. Oedipus, at the height of his career as King of Thebes, finds that he is his father's murderer, and that in ignorance he has married and begotten children by his mother. In expiation, he blinds himself crying:

> No more, no more shall you [my eyes] look on the misery about me, the horrors of my own doing! Too long you have known the faces of those whom I should never have seen, too long been blind to those for whom I was searching! From this hour, go in darkness!

To be a fated patricide, to suffer violation of family bonds, exile, blindness, physical pain—what else could a man bear without dying? Yet add to these, anxiety, guilt, poverty, and we can understand why Oedipus is a prototype of human suffering and tragedy.

Losing the eyes of ordinary men, Oedipus began to see. In the years which follow his exile from Thebes he gains another kind of sight. We do not know *how* he changes—this is a secret of his egoic odyssey—yet he turns his guilt into self-knowledge concerning the foibles of an unexamined public life, of a morality of personal relationships acquired without question; then he accepts partial responsibility for his past, leaving the rest to be reconciled in the inexplicable cycle which, it seems, has chosen him as its example and instrument. There is here a profound display of the dual nature of Manas—a mystery truly, in which sight is born of blindness.

Oedipus made peace with his past; he assimilated his lower nature

and then could see into the future. An opposite destiny came to Prometheus. He saw into the future, yet lost (or gave up) his godly position in order to bring to man the qualities of a spiritual being—a being who could later participate in the Oedipus cycle. Prometheus gave man the opportunity to be imperfect, to fail, to be debased, or to raise himself to the dignity and purity of the gods. H.P.B. has this illuminating passage:

> Perfection, to be fully such, must be born out of imperfection, the incorruptible must grow out of the corruptible, having the latter as its vehicle and basis and contrast.

Needless to say, the gods felt that Prometheus' work was trespassing on their territory—if intelligence were to be added to man's potential to grow, nothing would remain secure or at peace. Elsewhere H.P.B. portrays our hero in human dimensions:

> This drama of the struggle of Prometheus with the olympic tyrant and despot, sensual Zeus, one sees daily within our actual mankind: the lower passions chain the higher aspirations to the rock of matter, to generate in many a case the vulture of sorrow, pain and repentance.

Both the "lower passions" and the "higher aspirations" represent aspects of the principle of Manas. Prometheus is of the type of the Higher Ego who "sacrifices himself to himself to save the worlds."

The tales of Oedipus and Prometheus are dramatic portrayals of the Soul's pilgrimage. Oedipus is the tough, ambitious aspirant to knowledge of himself and the world; Prometheus is Oedipus matured, born into another life. Both tell the story of Manasic possibilities.

Measure of Fulfillment

The way in which a man accepts, the way in which he bears his cross, what courage he manifests in suffering, what dignity he displays in doom and disaster, is the measure of his human fulfillment. . . . A man's life retains its meaning up to the last—until he draws his last breath. As long as he remains conscious, he is under obligation to realize values, even if these be only attitudinal values. As long as he has consciousness, he has responsibilities. This responsibility remains with him to the last moment of his existence.

—Viktor Frankl

MORALITY AND PANTHEISM

[This article first appeared in the *Theosophist* for November, 1883. Its importance as a statement of the Theosophical philosophy in relation to the God-idea is self-evident. Appearing shortly after completion of the long series, "Fragments of Occult Truth," some of the installments of which were written by A. O. Hume, some by A. P. Sinnett, others by Subba Row, often with annotations by H.P.B., Damodar K. Mavalankar, and occasionally by the Theosophical Adepts, we may reasonably think that "Morality and Pantheism" was printed in further clarification of questions raised by this series. While it was later reprinted in *Five Years of Theosophy*, with the name of Mohini M. Chatterji appended at the end, its ring of authority and freedom of expression intimate the highest of sources. It is suggestive that on page 644 of Vol. I of *The Secret Doctrine*, published five years later, a passage concerning the "law of occult dynamics" is quoted from "Morality and Pantheism" without any note as to its origin.—Editors, THEOSOPHY.]

QUESTIONS have been raised in several quarters as to the inefficiency of Pantheism (which term is intended to include Esoteric Buddhism, Advaiti Vedantism, and other similar religious systems) to supply a sound basis of morality. The philosophical assimilation of *meum* and *tuum*, it is urged, must of necessity be followed by their practical confusion, resulting in the sanction of cruelty, robbery, etc. This line of argument points, however, most unmistakably to the coëxistence of the objection with an all but utter ignorance of the systems objected to, in the critic's mind, as we shall show by-and-by. The ultimate sanction of morality, as is well known, is derived from a desire for the attainment of happiness and escape from misery. But schools differ in their estimate of happiness.

Exoteric religions base their morality on the hope of reward and fear of punishment at the hands of an Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe by following the rules he has at his pleasure laid down for the obedience of his helpless subjects; in some cases, however, religions of later growth have made morality to depend on the sentiment of

gratitude to that Ruler for benefits received. The worthlessness, not to speak of the mischievousness, of such systems of morality is almost self-evident. As a type of morality founded on hope and fear, we shall take an instance from the Christian *Bible*: "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord." The duty of supporting the poor is here made to depend upon prudential motives of laying by for a time when the "giver to the poor" will be incapable of taking care of himself. But the *Mahabharata* says that "He that desireth a return for his good deeds loseth all merit; he is like a merchant bartering his goods." The true springs of morality lose their elasticity under the pressure of such criminal selfishness; all pure and unselfish natures will fly away from it in disgust.

To avoid such consequences attempts have been made by some recent reformers of religion to establish morality upon the sentiment of gratitude to the Lord. But it requires no deep consideration to find that, in their endeavours to shift the basis of morality, these reformers have rendered morality entirely baseless. A man has to do what is represented to be a thing "dear unto the Lord" out of gratitude for the many blessings he has heaped upon him. But as a matter of fact he finds that the Lord has heaped upon him curses as well as blessings. A helpless orphan is expected to be grateful to him for having removed the props of his life, his parents, because he is told in consolation that such a calamity is but *apparently* an evil, but in reality the All-Merciful has underneath it hidden the greatest possible good. With equal reason might a preacher of the "avenging" Ahriman exhort men to believe that under the *apparent* blessings of the "Merciful" Father there lurks the serpent of evil.

The modern Utilitarians, though the range of their vision is so narrow, have sterner logic in their teachings. That which tends to a man's happiness is good, and must be followed, and the contrary shunned as evil. So far so good. But the practical application of the doctrine is fraught with mischief. Cribbed, cabined, and confined, by rank Materialism, within the short space between birth and death, the Utilitarians' scheme of happiness is merely a deformed torso, which cannot certainly be considered as the fair goddess of our devotion.

The only scientific basis of morality is to be sought for in the soul-consoling doctrines of Lord Buddha or Shri Shankaracharya. The starting-point of the "pantheistic" (we use the word for want of a better one) system of morality is a clear perception of the unity

of the one energy operating in the manifested cosmos, the grand result which it is incessantly striving to produce, and the affinity of the immortal human spirit and its latent powers with that energy, and its capacity to coöperate with the One Life in achieving its mighty object.

Now knowledge or Jnanam is divided into two classes by Advaiti philosophers—Paroksha and Aparoksha. The former kind of knowledge consists in intellectual assent to a stated proposition, the latter in the actual realization of it. The object which a Buddhist Advaiti Yogi sets before himself is the realization of the oneness of existence, and the practice of morality is the most powerful means to that end, as we proceed to show. The principal obstacle to the realization of this oneness is the inborn habit of man of always placing himself at the centre of the Universe. Whatever a man might act, think, or feel, the irrepressible personality is sure to be the central figure. This, as will appear on reflection, is that which prevents every individual from filling his proper sphere in existence, where he only is exactly in place and no other individual is. The realization of this harmony is the practical or objective aspect of the Grand Problem. And the practice of morality is the effort to find out this sphere; morality, indeed, is the Ariadne's clue in the Cretan labyrinth in which man is placed.

From the study of the sacred philosophy preached by Lord Buddha or Shri Shankara, Paroksha knowledge (or shall we say *belief*?) in the unity of existence is derived, but without the practice of morality that knowledge cannot be converted into the highest kind of knowledge, or Aparoksha Jnanam, and thus lead to the attainment of Mukti. It availeth naught to intellectually grasp the notion of your being everything or Brahma, if it is not realized in practical acts of life. To confuse *meum* and *tuum* in the vulgar sense is but to destroy the harmony of existence by a false assertion of "I," and is as foolish as the anxiety to nourish the legs at the expense of the arms. You cannot be one with all, unless all your acts, thoughts, and feelings synchronize with the onward march of Nature. What is meant by the Brahmajnani being beyond the reach of Karma, can be fully realized only by a man who has found out his exact position in harmony with the One Life in Nature; that man sees how a Brahmajnani can act only in unison with Nature, and never in discord with it; to use the phraseology of ancient writers on Occultism, a Brahmajnani is a real "co-worker with Nature." Not only Eu-

ropean Sanskritists, but also exoteric Yogis, fall into the grievous mistake of supposing that, in the opinion of our sacred writers, a human being can escape the operation of the law of Karma by adopting a condition of masterly inactivity, entirely losing sight of the fact that even a rigid abstinence from physical acts does not produce inactivity on the higher astral and spiritual planes.

Shri Shankara has very conclusively proved, in his commentaries on the *Bhagavad Gita,* that such a supposition is nothing short of a delusion. The great teacher shows there that forcibly repressing the physical body from working does not free one from Vasana or vritti—the inherent inclination of the mind to work. There is a tendency, in every department of Nature, for an act to repeat itself; the Karma acquired in the last preceding birth is always trying to forge fresh links in the chain, and thereby lead to continued material existence; and this tendency can only be counteracted by unselfishly performing all the duties appertaining to the sphere in which a person is born; such a course alone can produce Chitta-Suddhi (purification of the mind), without which the capacity of perceiving spiritual truths can never be acquired.

A few words must be said about the physical inactivity of the Yogi or the Mahatma. Inactivity of the physical body (Sthula Sharira) does not indicate a condition of inactivity either on the astral or the spiritual plane of action. The human spirit is in its highest state of activity in Samadhi (highest trance) and not, as it is generally supposed, in a dormant, quiescent condition. And, moreover, it will be easily seen, by anyone who examines the nature of occult dynamics, that a given amount of energy expended on the spiritual or astral plane is productive of far greater results than the same amount expended on the physical objective plane of existence. When an Adept has placed himself *en rapport* with the universal mind he becomes a real power in Nature. Even on the objective plane of existence the difference between brain and muscular energy, in their capacity of producing wide-spread and far-reaching results, can be very easily perceived. The amount of physical energy expended by the discoverer of the steam-engine might not have been more than that expended by a hard-working day-labourer, but the practical results of the labourer's work can never be compared with the results achieved by the discovery of the steam-engine. Similarly, the ultimate effects of spiritual energy are infinitely greater than those of intellectual energy.

From the above considerations it is abundantly clear that the initiatory training of a true Vedantin Raja Yogi must be the nourishing of a sleepless and ardent desire of doing all in his power for the good of mankind on the ordinary physical plane, his activity being transferred, however, to the higher astral and spiritual planes as his development proceeds. In course of time, as the Truth becomes realized, the situation is rendered quite clear to the Yogi, and he is placed beyond the criticism of any ordinary man. The *Mahanirvana Tantra* says:

Charanti trigunatite ko vidhir ko nishedhave.

"For one, walking beyond the three Gunas—Sattva (feeling of gratification), Rajas (passional activity) and Tamas (inertness)—what injunction or what restriction is there?"—in the consideration of men, walled in on all sides by the objective plane of existence. This does not mean that a Mahatma can or will ever neglect the laws of morality, but that he, having unified his individual nature with Great Nature herself, is constitutionally incapable of violating any one of the laws of nature, and no man can constitute himself a judge of the conduct of the Great One without knowing the laws of all the planes of Nature's activity. As honest men are honest without the least consideration of the criminal law, so a Mahatma is moral without reference to the laws of morality.

These are, however, sublime topics: we shall before conclusion notice some other considerations which lead the ordinary "pantheist" to the true foundation of morality. Happiness has been defined by John Stuart Mill as the state of absence of opposition. Manu gives the definition in more forcible terms:

Sarvan paravasham duhkham
Sarva matmavasham sukham
Idam jneyo samasena
Lakshanam sukhaduhkhayo.

"Every kind of subjugation to another is pain, and subjugation to one's self is happiness: in brief, this is to be known as the characteristic marks of the two." Now, it is universally admitted that the whole system of Nature is moving in a particular direction, and this direction, we are taught, is determined by the composition of two forces—namely, the one acting from that pole of existence ordinarily called "matter" towards the other pole called "spirit," and the other in the opposite direction. The very fact that Nature is moving shows

that these two forces are not equal in magnitude. The plane on which the activity of the first force predominates is called in occult treatises the "ascending arc," and the corresponding plane of the activity of the other force is styled the "descending arc." A little reflection will show that the work of evolution begins on the descending arc and works its way upwards through the ascending arc.

From this it follows that the force directed towards spirit is the one which must, though not without hard struggle, ultimately prevail. This is the great directing energy of Nature, and, although disturbed by the operation of the antagonistic force, it is this that gives the law to her; the other is merely its negative aspect, for convenience regarded as a separate agent. If an individual attempts to move in a direction other than that in which Nature is moving, that individual is sure to be crushed, sooner or later, by the enormous pressure of the opposing force. We need not say that such a result would be the very reverse of pleasurable. The only way, therefore, in which happiness might be attained is by merging one's nature in great Mother Nature, and following the direction in which she herself is moving; this again can only be accomplished by assimilating men's individual conduct with the triumphant force of Nature, the other force being always overcome with terrific catastrophes. The effort to assimilate the individual with the universal law is popularly known as the practice of morality. Obedience to this universal law, after ascertaining it, is true religion, which has been defined by Lord Buddha as "realization of the True."

An example will serve to illustrate the position. Can a practical pantheist, or, in other words, an occultist, utter a falsehood? Now, it will be readily admitted that life manifests itself by the power of acquiring sensation, temporary dormancy of that power being suspended animation. If a man receives a particular series of sensations and pretends they are other than they really are, the result is that he exercises his will-power in opposition to a law of Nature on which, as we have shown, life depends, and thereby becomes a suicide on a minor scale. Space prevents further discussion, but all the ten deadly sins mentioned by Manu and Buddha can be satisfactorily dealt with in the light sought to be focussed here.

letters • questions • comment

The statement is often made that the Self shines in all, but in all it does not shine forth. If this Self is as great as is indicated in the philosophy, it is hard to see what could prevent its "shining forth." How should this statement be understood?

Paradoxically, the simple is often profound. This question, with its implications, is an example of the way in which a philosophical truth, phrased in few words, is capable of elaboration by the student.

The maxim must first be seen as the distillation of a concept and one which can be used as a focus for study and meditation. While in one sense it is specific and direct, from another point of view it is capable of continued expansion. Or, to put it in another way, it shares the characteristic of various art forms of suggesting an idea or a truth, while leaving to the individual the function of applying his own experience and understanding to that truth.

There is, first of all, the concept of Self. Every thinking man has some idea of what is meant by this term, even though he may not be versed in philosophy. If he considers the idea of *my*self he doubtless thinks of himself as an individual, perhaps of the very core or center of his being, even as self the perceiver. Looking out from that center he sees other selves—*him*self, *her*self, *them*selves. Knowing that in some ways all men are alike, he may admit that all these selves look out at life, each one from its own center, just as he does. At first this may seem to suggest a fragmented idea of Self—each one different and unpredictable in action and reaction. This seems to be the assumption of all those who act on a separative basis, or in a fashion contrary to what Theosophists term the "laws of brotherhood." It is certainly the basis of any group which sets itself against or above some other group of beings.

However, extending the concept of Self, it is but a step to the idea that while there may be innumerable applications of a power, there is still but one Power—many expressions of one idea, many personifications of one Principle. This is, of course, the binding together of all in one whole, which should be the basis of true religion.

In this connection Robert Crosbie states:

> Religion is a *bond* uniting men together—not a particular set of dogmas or beliefs—binding not only all Men, but also all Beings and all *things* in the entire Universe, into one grand whole.

Having come this far in his consideration, the student may grant that ideally the "Self of one is the Self of all," but realistically appraising the world about him, he sees that this Self is not shining forth, and he asks why: what could possibly obscure such a brilliant and all-pervasive light? The analogy often used is that of electricity, a power with which we are all familiar. This one motive force acts in many ways, depending on the vehicle through which it passes or which it propels. Another aspect of this analogy not always noted is that this power is only occasionally transformed into light, and that light seems to be a better expression of its own inherent nature than the other more mechanical uses to which it is put. A flash of lightning seems to be electricity in its natural state; the glow of an electric bulb a small representation of electricity, and any of the many electric motors a further stepping down or embedding in gross matter of that same vital impulse.

Now let us consider man in relation to Self. Every aspect of his nature is powered by or centered in the Self. But all of his vehicles do not reflect the luminosity of the Self—the power is being used in a different way. There is something about the concept of the Self shining forth which seems to generate the idea of communication—a light not hidden, not operating unseen, but out-going, to be perceived and received by another being. The student may think of this as the light of mind passing from one to another, an understanding of like by like. But the Self, while present in the principle of Mind, is still more inclusive, for it is the one fundamental unity, pervading and sustaining all. It would seem that those qualities in a man's nature which we ascribe to the spiritual represent the luminous nature of Self and are the ones wherein the Self shines *forth*, while other actions, still drawing upon the same power, have less of the light-giving force. The Self is not absent from any point in space or consciousness. It *is*, but its "light" grows with our growing realization of the unity of life, and that light then shines out upon all.

THE AGELESS REPOSITORIES

AS Plato and many other sages of antiquity affirm, the Mysteries were highly religious, moral and beneficent as a school of ethics. The Sacred Mysteries were enacted in the ancient temples by the initiated Hierophants for the benefit and instruction of the candidate. The sacerdotal secret jargon employed by the initiated priests, and used only when discussing sacred things, was the Mystery language. Every nation had its own "mystery" tongue, unknown save to those admitted to the Mysteries.

The reason why in every age so little has been generally known of the mysteries of initiation, is two-fold. The first has been explained by more than one author, and lies in the terrible penalty following the least indiscretion. The second, is the superhuman difficulties and even dangers which the daring candidate of old had to encounter, and either conquer, or die in the attempt, when, what is still worse, he did not lose his reason. There was no real danger to him whose mind had become thoroughly spiritualized, and so prepared for every terrific sight. He who fully recognized the power of his immortal spirit, and never doubted for one moment its omnipotent protection, had naught to fear. But woe to the candidate in whom the slightest physical fear—sickly child of matter—made him lose sight and faith in his own invulnerability. He who was not wholly confident of his moral fitness to accept the burden of these tremendous secrets was doomed.

The Mysteries were observances, generally kept secret from the profane and uninitiated, in which were taught by dramatic representation and other methods the origin of things, the nature of the human spirit, its relation to the body, and the method of its purification and restoration to a higher life. They were, in every country, a series of dramatic performances, in which the mysteries of cosmogony and nature, in general, were personified by the priests and neophytes, who enacted the parts of the various gods and goddesses, repeating supposed scenes (allegories) from their respective lives. These

---

NOTE.—A student's collation from Theosophical sources.

were explained in their hidden meaning to the candidate, and incorporated into philosophical doctrines. Physical science, medicine, the laws of music, divination, were all taught in the same manner by dramatic representation.

To disbelieve that there exist in man certain arcane powers, which, by psychological study he can develop in himself to the highest degree, become an hierophant and then impart to others under the same conditions of earthly discipline, is to cast an imputation of falsehood and lunacy upon a number of the best, purest, and most learned men of antiquity and of the middle ages. What the hierophant was allowed to see at the last hour is hardly hinted at by them. And yet Pythagoras, Plato, Plotinus, Iamblichus, Proclus, and many others knew and affirmed their reality.

The philosophy of Plato was taught and illustrated in the Mysteries. Augustine of Hippo declares that the doctrines of the Alexandrian Platonists were the original esoteric doctrines of the first followers of Plato, and describes Plotinus as a Plato resuscitated. He also explains the motives of the great philosopher for veiling the interior sense of what he taught. In the Mysteries were symbolized the pre-existent condition of the spirit and soul, the lapse of the latter into earth-life and Hades, the miseries of that life, the purification of the soul, and its restoration to divine bliss, or reunion with spirit. "Out of Plato," says Emerson, "come all things that are still written and debated among men of thought."

It is certain that Pythagoras awakened the deepest intellectual sympathy of his age, and that his doctrines exerted a powerful influence upon the mind of Plato. His cardinal idea was that there existed a permanent principle of unity beneath the forms, changes, and other phenomena of the universe. The key to Pythagorean dogmas is the general formula of unity in multiplicity, the one evolving the many and pervading the many. This is the ancient doctrine of emanation in a few words. Even the apostle Paul accepted it as true. "Out of him and through him and in him all things are." This is purely Hindu and Brahmanical: "When the dissolution, Pralaya, had arrived at its term, the great Being—Paramatma and Parapurusha, the Lord existing through himself, out of whom and through whom all things were, are and will be—resolved to emanate from his own substance the various creatures" (*Manava-Dharma-Shastra*).

So shrouded in mystery was the Hermetic Philosophy that Volney

asserted that the ancient peoples worshipped the gross material symbols as divine in themselves; whereas these were only considered as representing esoteric principles. Dupuis, after devoting many years of study to the problem, mistook the symbolic circle, and attributed their religion solely to astronomy. . . . How, without possessing a knowledge of the Mysteries was it possible for these men or others not endowed with the finer intuition of a Champollion, to discover the esoteric half of that which was concealed, behind the veil of Isis, from all except the adepts? The merit of Champollion as an Egyptologist none will question. He declares that everything demonstrates the ancient Egyptians to have been profoundly monotheistical. The accuracy of the writings of the mysterious Hermes Trismegistus, whose antiquity runs back into the night of time, is corroborated by him to their minutest details. Ennemoser also says: "Into Egypt and the East went Herodotus, Thales, Parmenides, Empedocles, Orpheus, and Pythagoras, to instruct themselves in Natural Philosophy and Theology." There, too, Moses acquired his wisdom, and Jesus passed the earlier years of his life. Thither gathered students of all countries before Alexandria was founded. "How comes it," Ennemoser goes on to say, "that so little has become known of these Mysteries, through so many ages and amongst so many different times and peoples? The answer is that it is owing to the universally strict silence of the initiated. Another cause may be found in the destruction and total loss of all the written memorials of the secret knowledge of the remotest antiquity."

"In ancient India, the mystery of the Triad, known but to the initiates, could not, under penalty of death, be revealed to the vulgar," says Vrihaspati. Neither could it in the ancient Grecian and Samothracian Mysteries. It is in the hands of the adepts, and must remain a mystery to the world so long as the materialistic savant regards it as an undemonstrated fallacy, an insane hallucination, and the dogmatic theologian a snare of the Evil One.

Aristotle was no trustworthy witness. He misrepresented Plato, and he almost caricatured the doctrines of Pythagoras. There is a canon of interpretation, which should guide us in our examinations of every philosophical opinion: "The human mind has, under the necessary operation of its own laws, been compelled to entertain the same fundamental ideas, and the human heart to cherish the same feelings in all ages." The unity of God, the immortality of the spirit, belief in salvation only through our works, merit and demerit; such

are the principle articles of faith of the Wisdom-religion, and the groundwork of Vedaism, Budhism, Parsism, and such we find to have been even that of ancient Osirism, when we, after abandoning the popular sun-god to the materialism of the rabble, confine our attention to the *Books of Hermes,* the thrice-great.

Too great dependence upon physical facts led to a growth of materialism and a decadence of spirituality and faith. At the time of Aristotle, this was the prevailing tendency of thought. And though the Delphic commandment was not as yet completely eliminated from Grecian thought; and some philosophers still held that "in order to know what man *is,* we ought to know what man *was*"—still materialism had already begun to gnaw at the root of faith. The Mysteries themselves had degenerated in a very great degree into mere priestly speculations and religious fraud. Few were the true adepts and initiates, the heirs and descendants of those who had been dispersed by the conquering swords of various invaders of Old Egypt.

Schweigger shows that a *lost natural philosophy of antiquity* was connected with the most important religious ceremonies. He demonstrates in the amplest manner, that *magic* in the prehistoric period had a part in the Mysteries and that the greatest phenomena, the so-called miracles—whether Pagan, Jewish, or Christian—rested in fact on the arcane knowledge of the ancient priest of physics and all the branches of chemistry, or rather alchemy.

Our physicists pride themselves on the achievements of our century [19th] and exchange antiphonal hymns of praise. . . . Do they forget, or are they utterly unaware of the fact, that in the absence of [nature's] legitimate sovereign, this throne is but a whitened sepulchre, inside of which all is rottenness and corruption! That matter without the spirit which vivifies it, and of which it is but the "gross purgation," to use a hermetic expression, is nothing but a soulless corpse, whose limbs, in order to be moved in a predetermined direction, require an intelligent operator at the great galvanic battery called LIFE!

Plato's method, like that of geometry, was to descend from universals to particulars. . . . The dullest of Plato's disciples could tell more about great cosmic laws and their mutual relations, and demonstrate a familiarity with and control over occult forces which lie behind them, than the most learned professor in the most distinguished academy of our day.

on the lookout

"The Quest for Instant Satori"

Under this heading, S. I. Hayakawa, editor of *ETC.*, writes a foreword to the December special issue, titled "The Psychedelic Experience." This is the fifth "special issue," each of which has explored a topic of current interest from the point of view of general semantics; and the number of "unsolicited manuscripts" that came in on psychedelic research, Mr. Hayakawa says, showed that this subject is of "wide-spread interest, both scientific and popular."

Dr. Robert E. Mogar, of San Francisco State College, and director of the Institute for Psychedelic Research, served as editor for the December issue, and the majority of the articles seem strongly slanted in favor of research in his field—so much so, indeed, that Mr. Hayakawa remarks:

> For all my gratitude to Dr. Mogar and the personal regard in which I hold the contributors to this issue, I am forced by my own convictions to introduce a discordant note. I am far from convinced of the therapeutic or "spiritual" value of the psychedelic experience. Indeed, I cannot get rid of the feeling that this issue is likely to do the world as much harm as good. In the present climate of opinion, with hallucinogens like LSD available on almost every college campus in the U.S., the glowing accounts of "consciousness-expanding" experiences resulting from their use under controlled and responsible supervision are all too likely to be seized upon as justification for their uncontrolled use without medical or scientific supervision of any kind.

Psychedelics and General Semantics

"The most interesting semantic point made by contributors to this issue," says Mr. Hayakawa, "is that under the influence of psychedelic drugs, one is 'freed' from the categories and symbolizations through which our experience is ordinarily presented to us. . . ." But he questions the beneficial effects, since an "abnormal functioning" of the brain is not necessarily a "supernormal functioning." Mr. Hayakawa continues:

> The fact that symbolic processes often go awry is, of course, well known to general semanticists, who have their own prescriptions as to what to do about it. These involve learning to experience at nonverbal levels, refraining from "bursting into speech," and maintaining "silence, within and without." These also involve learning to establish a constant interplay between experiential and higher levels of abstraction, checking each level against those below, and all of them against the realities of the world. Disciplines such as these are not easy to master. They involve for many of us the upsetting of cherished ideas and the relinquishing of many long-ingrained automatisms of thought and speech. . . . General semantics, like many other disciplines offering deliverance from the world of illusion and self-delusion, offers no easy path to enlightenment.

A careful reading of the foregoing will show the philosophic cast in the ideas expressed by Mr. Hayakawa, in the terms of his field.

"Mysticism and General Semantics"

Under this title, Edward Dalton, in the same issue of *ETC.,* contrasts what he regards as true mystical experience with the alleged "transcending experience" or "consciousness expansion" of the psychedelic drugs. Of the former, he says:

> The term "mystical experience" has an unfortunate spooky quality for most readers. One is led to think of a kind of trance, something other-worldly, or even of supernatural creatures. In point of fact, most of those who have had a mystical experience report that this state of mind is more concrete and more natural, the insights gained more simple, certain, and unified, than that which occupies the everyday consciousness. How can we come to know the mystical experience intellectually, which we must do if we are to discuss it in terms of the notions of general semantics? That it is ineffable goes, of course, without saying.
>
> We can begin by calling it by its various names—realization, enlightenment, awakening, satori, transcendent experience, consciousness expansion, cosmic consciousness. In some religious writings it is called union with God, and sometimes, in the language of clinical psychology, depersonalization. What is central to all these descriptions is the relaxation of the distinction between the individual and his surroundings, and the concomitant increase in awareness of the relationship with his environment.
>
> The increased identification with the previously "external" world, the sharpened awareness of the mutuality of its varied processes and his own, produces a feeling of oneness with all nature. . . . The world as seen in the new view is possessed of an all-pervading sense of love, because it is a world where no one, and no thing, is alone.

Semantic Emphases in the Tao Te King

Lao-tzu, in Mr. Dalton's estimation, was concerned with semantic clarity when he warned in the *Tao Te King* about "the mechanics of speaking and writing, too much preoccupation with good form, or with the status afforded through the use of an impressive vocabulary." In the following paragraph, Mr. Dalton paraphrases Lao-tzu's remarks on this subject from the standpoint of existential general semantics:

> Language is rather an approximation to reality, but we use it because it is a way of comparing one person's subjective experience with that of another. However, because language, particularly words and concepts, plays such a large part in our everyday life, we are in danger of regarding it as fundamental, placing all of our attention on the words themselves, rather than the experience they are meant to communicate. To the degree to which we lose the ability to distinguish language from reality, mistaking, as it were, the map for the territory, we become estranged from life, because we are living on a diet of pure abstraction.

Mr. Dalton sees the Taoist position as "rather extreme" from the semantic point of view, for the Taoist seems to believe that "the entire ego—one's sense of individual self as distinct from his surroundings—is a fabrication based on language." On the other hand, he realizes that "some of the things that have been developed in Western context may turn out to be more subtle and to go far deeper than we at first supposed."

Further, the Zen disciplines, though based on the Taoist philosophy, have found expression in more popular forms, in the rituals and ceremonies of archery, judo, flower arrangement, and tea ceremony.

Some Relevant Questions

In discussing drug-induced perception, says Mr. Dalton, the following questions should be asked: "Is it authentic? Is it natural? Is it fair? Is it psychologically healthy?" So far as authenticity is concerned, Mr. Dalton asks again—with a tacit negative answer: "How can I be sure that I'll get the real thing? Will the experience I have be just like the one that happened to Moses, Paul, Gotama, or Lao-Tzu?" "Too often," says Mr. Dalton, "we use the word natural, when we mean to say familiar, sanctioned, or conventional. Isn't there something insipid about planning to have an enlightenment experience on a particular day or hour? Isn't it like planning to fall

in love at ten o'clock on Thursday evening?" Not only is drug-induced illumination not natural, Mr. Dalton points out, it is not even "fair." "Few of us," he says, "can tolerate the idea of something for nothing, especially when someone else is getting it. . . . Even Jesus was hard put to get this point across [grace, freely given, undeserved]." As for the question of its being psychologically healthy, Mr. Dalton says:

> Escape into another world via drugs—a lack of willingness to cope with real psychological or social problems. Direct personal testimony is most relevant here. Ask any user. If you have problems, LSD is not the place to hide from them. What about the danger of a psychotic break with reality? The conviction that there is one real world and the others hallucinatory, one right view and the others wrong, one good way and the others bad—this above all engenders man's most inhuman deeds.

Personal Striving—a Way of Life

One reviewer of the special issue of *ETC.* (*Manas,* April 20) commented as follows:

> All in all, the movement for psychedelic "liberation" may constitute a severe testing of the intuitive resources of humanistic psychologists who remain skeptical of this proposal for "releasing" human consciousness by subdivision, and giving the initiative in the enterprise to substances that can be bought in a bottle (with a little difficulty) at the store. This new, new version of the advantages brought to mankind by modern technology is subtler by far than the claims of the commodity multipliers and creature-comforts purveyors, and the appeal of spiritual delights climaxed by a chemical "illumination" that will dispense with long years of personal striving is likely to be persuasive to anyone able to believe that the universe is constructed for his effortless ease and translation. . . . It is surely appropriate here to recall that the Enlightenment achieved by the Buddha under the Bo tree involved neither a proprietor nor a proprietary, and to hazard the opinion that included in the range of tantalizing visions which attended his ordeal were all the possibilities of psychedelic "expansion of consciousness." But the Buddha was his own man, and they left him unmoved.

Some of the warnings against Hatha Yoga seem relevant here. But Hatha Yoga is at least a *discipline,* whereas the use of psychedelics and hallucinogens is an attempt to dispense with *all* effort. The long-range effects such practices may have on the psychic nature are yet to be discovered.

"God is Dead" Debate Widens

John Cogley, religious editor of *The New York Times,* reports on the small but much-publicized God-is-dead movement in Protestant theology (noted in February Lookout) in the *Times* for Jan. 9. The indignation of the "faithful," he says, takes many forms, from withholding donations to divinity schools that countenance such talk, demanding that its advocates be fired from their teaching posts, to editorials in church periodicals, such as the following quoted from *Christianity Today*:

> No one will deny these men the right to be atheists, but (we say it reverently) for God's sake let them be atheists outside of institutions supposedly training men to spread the Gospel that God is alive and that faith in His Son means life from the dead.

The most wholesome result of the controversy appears to be a widespread re-thinking of the God-idea, leading away from provincial and partisan attitudes. Dr. Thomas Altizer, one of the leaders of the movement, wrote in *The Christian Advocate*: "We cannot open ourselves to a new form of faith while remaining bound to the primordial God who has once and for all revealed his word: we will never pass through a new reformation until we liberate ourselves from the God of our Christian past."

A Most Unorthodox "Service"—and Counter-Measures

A small denominational college (North Carolina Wesleyan) is experimenting with a ritual designed to explore in liturgical form the experience of the "death of God." The litany consists of eight three-line verses, intoned by a reader, seven of which are followed by one line, repeated, by the chorus. It sketches the transition of the degree of *meaningfulness* of the God-idea from the time when "He was our guide and our stay" to the beginning of self-reliance, when the question arises: "Did we create Him in our image?/ Did we surround Him with hosts because/ We were afraid?" Then comes the acknowledgement that, "The universe is too vast for him," "Heaven is empty"; finally ending with the following lines:

Reader:

Why is there no dawn?
Why do our dead only die?
Why do our living only live?

Chorus:

Your God is Dead
He died in the darkness of your image
He died because he grew ill from your
dreams of salvation
He died because you held his hand too
tightly
God is Dead.

According to a campus reporter, says the *Times,* "the reaction ranged from tears to a new enthusiasm for theology." What the general reaction of the public will be to television excerpts, including the impact of the last chorus—with its dramatic crescendo in both tone and fervor—is yet to be assessed. (It was shown on KNXT, Los Angeles, Feb. 7.)

As might be expected, plans are being made by conservative groups to counteract the message of this ritual. For example, the National Council of Churches will sponsor a series of television spot announcements whose official slogan will be: "Keep in circulation the rumor that God is alive." (*The New York Times,* Jan. 22.)

Evolution of the God-Idea

Dr. Martin E. Marty, of the University of Chicago divinity school, acknowledges that the radicals "have their finger on the 'hot button'." They "have hold of a big and important issue, one about which many theologians are nervous, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike." The *Times* writer continues:

> The issue, which has long been a conversational staple in university dining halls, is that the "God" of the catechisms and the philosophical formulations is "dead," in the sense that the conventional ecclesiastical language and the theological categories that describe Him have become meaningless to modern men. The God "up there" somewhere in outer space is "dead" to the modern believer who would no more look for Him in the wild blue yonder than the first Soviet astronauts did.
>
> The God who presided over secular culture and a Church-dominated "Christendom" for centuries was "dead" when men began to take human affairs into their own hands. The God whose official representatives presumed to regulate science and limit research was "dead," when the arts and sciences declared their autonomy from theological dictatorship. The resulting "religious crisis," now reaching a climax, cuts through almost every area of modern life. . . .
>
> Dr. Harold A. Bosley said recently that the word "God" has

> been cheapened by so much misuse that it is understandable that new theologians no longer find it capable of interpreting the ultimate meanings of life which they find and are trying to describe. "I honor them for their humility even as I question the necessity or the finality of the position they take."

Dr. Bosley added, however, that in his view the "death" theologians are missing an essential point: "It is the contention of religious thinkers like Tillich, Whitehead, Wieman, and many others, that the more we investigate and attempt to think about our experiences of meaning, the more certainly we are led to the conviction that there is an essential unity in the separate meanings of life, and this unity they call God." In searching for meanings, such thinkers are joining hands with some of our leading psychologists and psychiatrists.

Man-Spirit Proves God-Spirit

Ninety years ago H. P. Blavatsky and her Teachers suggested a similar approach. We have to start with Man and his world, they said. In *Isis Unveiled* (I, vi), Mme. Blavatsky wrote:

> [The Sages of the Orient] showed us that by combining science with religion, the existence of God and immortality of man's spirit may be demonstrated like a problem of Euclid. For the first time we received the assurance that the Oriental philosophy has room for no other faith than an absolute and immovable faith in the omnipotence of man's own immortal self. We were taught that this omnipotence comes from the kinship of man's spirit with the Universal Soul—God! The latter, they said, can never be demonstrated but by the former. Man-spirit proves God-spirit, as the one drop of water proves a source from which it must have come. . . . prove the soul of man by its wondrous powers—you have proved God!

Metaphysical Subtlety of Importance

Yet even the Universal Soul is not the Absolute Principle of the First Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine*. In Volume II (p. 555), H.P.B. states that "to avoid anthropomorphic conceptions . . . the Initiates never use the epithet 'God' to designate the One and Secondless Principle in the Universe." She suggests, however, that here, too, man is the Key: "Between speculative Atheism and idiotic anthropomorphism there must be a philosophical mean, and a reconciliation. The Presence of the Unseen Principle throughout all nature, and the highest manifestation of it on Earth—MAN, can alone help to solve the Problem . . ." Meanwhile, it is appro-

priate to recall these words (*S.D.* I, 326): "The evolution of the GOD-IDEA proceeds apace with man's own intellectual evolution. So true it is that the noblest ideal to which the religious Spirit of one age can soar, will appear but a gross caricature to the philosophic mind in a succeeding epoch!"

Search for God Continues

Apparently it is not only the "death-of-God theologians" who feel that "Space has stretched beyond Him. . . . The universe is too vast for him": *Look's* lead article for Feb. 22, "An American Bishop's Search for a Space-Age God," reports on the Rt. Rev. James A. Pike's sabbatical in England, at Cambridge University, where he admittedly hopes to have the time and intellectual freedom "to find out what I really do believe." He has at least found out what he does not believe, for he has "jettisoned the Trinity, the Virgin Birth and the Incarnation." Regarding these, *Look* writes:

> Bishop Pike argues that the Trinity, set forth by Greek-influenced Christians of the fourth century, becomes confused with polytheism. He quips: "The Moslems offer one God and three wives; we offer three Gods and one wife. No wonder Christianity is losing in Africa."
>
> The earliest Gospel, St. Mark, did not mention the Virgin Birth, and St. Paul regarded Jesus as born of a woman under the law. Bishop Pike also notes the genealogy from David to Jesus comes down through Joseph. "If this is true," he says, "the literal Virgin Birth isn't."
>
> That Jesus was man, though so perfect that God adopted Him, is the heresy of "adoptionism," for it denies that Jesus was God Incarnate. "My position," says Bishop Pike, "is not even that traditional, for adoptionism presupposes a special act of God. I've rejected that God does special things. Jesus freely adopted the Messianic role. God was able to flow through because Jesus was more open.
>
> God didn't choose Christ, says Bishop Pike. Christ chose God. . . .

Unorthodoxy in High Places

Bishop Pike has spent as much time as possible with Bishop Robinson, of *Honest to God* fame. Bishop Robinson, says *Look,* makes a distinction between himself and his guest: "We're moving in the same direction, but from different points. Bishop Pike says: 'Why don't we say what we mean, in creed, language, and liturgy? Why don't we cut down on the packaging?' I am asking, 'What do we

really mean by what we say? When we use a word like God, what realities are we talking about?' I feel we don't know what we mean. We are being compelled to an agonizing reappraisal." A London publisher, says *Look,* puts it even more bluntly:

> The new theology implies a rejection of any picture of God as Father, with no clear picture of God replacing the old. God, as encountered, is the God inside people. In Christian terms, this amounts to the abandonment of teaching about God the Father, a re-emphasis of teaching about God as Holy Spirit, and a great uncertainty about the identity of Jesus.

The present interest in re-assessing terms, the attempt to internalize or subjectivize "God," and the recognition of the Christos, or the Christ-spirit, *in man*—all are evidences of what might be called a "theosophizing" search among Christians. As *Look* concludes: "The thinkers of the new theology share little but their faith. They chart their own courses past the boundaries of orthodoxy."

Science Also Losing Influence

While the relevance of God and religion are being questioned by radical Christians, it seems significant that science is also being taken to task, and losing prestige. *The New York Times* for Dec. 5 states:

> Interest in science is reported in a "strong decline" among career-minded high school students who regard the scientist as "gray, colorless and unaware of what's going on around him." A space research official said last week that the situation existed despite increased Federal expenditures on science education tenfold since the Soviet Union launched Sputnik I in 1957. . . .
>
> "Science has not become more interesting to young people unless they are already deeply motivated by it," said Dr. Robert Jastrow, director of the New York branch of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Goddard Institute for Space Studies. Dr. Jastrow . . . is also adjunct professor of geophysics at Columbia University. . . . "Scientists, abetted by science writers, have encouraged the image that they are in a dehumanized field of work open only to a gifted few," he said. . . . The trend away from science was "still valid" in 1965 . . . [when] biology and mathematics were the only sciences still surpassing government, teaching and the humanities as lures for high school students.